

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 JOHN FARRELL, on behalf of himself and all  
7 others similarly situated,

8 Plaintiff,

9 vs.

10 DIRECTV, LLC,

11 Defendant.

12 NO.

13 **COMPLAINT—CLASS ACTION**

14 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15  
16 John Farrell, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, alleges the  
17 following against Defendant DIRECTV, LLC (“DIRECTV”).

18 **I. NATURE OF ACTION**

19 1. In 2017 and 2018, Mr. Farrell received at least 30 marketing calls from or on  
20 behalf of DIRECTV on his cellular phone. DIRECTV or its agents repeatedly called Mr. Farrell  
21 to solicit his purchase of DIRECTV service.

22 2. The calls had all the signs of being placed using an automated telephone dialing  
23 system (“ATDS”). When Mr. Farrell answered his phone and said hello, no one would  
24 immediately answer. Many times, Mr. Farrell was forced to repeatedly say, “Hello, hello,  
25 hello,” before an agent would come on the line and ask Mr. Farrell if he wanted to purchase  
26 DIRECTV’s services.

1       3.     Mr. Farrell has never been a DIRECTV customer and did not consent to receive  
 2 calls from or on behalf of DIRECTV. Although Mr. Farrell repeatedly asked DIRECTV to stop  
 3 the calls, DIRECTV continued to call him without his consent.

4       4.     Plaintiff brings this class action for damages and other equitable and legal  
 5 remedies resulting from DIRECTV's violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47  
 6 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* ("TCPA") and the Federal Communication Commission rules  
 7 promulgated thereunder, 47 C.F.R. § 1200 ("FCC Rules").

## 8                   **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

9       5.     Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, this Court has original subject matter jurisdiction  
 10 over Plaintiffs' claims under TCPA and FCC Rules because they present a federal question.

11      6.     This Court also has jurisdiction over this class action under the Class Action  
 12 Fairness Act, 23 U.S.C. § 1332(d). There are at least one hundred members of the proposed  
 13 Class. The aggregated claims of individual Class members exceed the sum value of \$5,000,000  
 14 exclusive of interest and costs, and this is a class action in which DIRECTV and more than  
 15 two-thirds of the proposed Class are citizens of different states. Plaintiff alleges a nationwide  
 16 Class with, on information and belief, tens of thousands of members, each of whom is entitled  
 17 to up to \$1,500.00 in statutory damages for each call that violated the TCPA and the FCC  
 18 Rules.

19      7.     This Court has personal jurisdiction over DIRECTV because DIRECTV  
 20 directed the calls that are the subject of this action to Plaintiff's cellular telephone. DIRECTV  
 21 continuously and systematically conducts business in Washington, including within this  
 22 District.

23      8.     Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial  
 24 part of the events and omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District.

## 25                   **III. PARTIES**

26      9.     Plaintiff John Farrell resides in Tacoma, Washington.  
 27

1       10. Defendant DIRECTV, LLC is a California Limited Liability Company with  
 2 headquarters at 2260 E. Imperial Hwy, El Segundo, CA 90245. The allegations in this  
 3 Complaint as to acts and omissions by DIRECTV shall be construed as allegations against the  
 4 DIRECTV, whether such conduct was committed by DIRECTV directly, or through its agents  
 5 or contractors.

6                                  **IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

7                                  **A. DIRECTV's pattern of TCPA violations.**

8       11. DIRECTV has been sued by the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") and  
 9 consumers on numerous occasions for violations of the TCPA and the FCC Rules.

10      12. On December 12, 2005, the United States Department of Justice filed suit  
 11 against DIRECTV on behalf of the FTC. *United States v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, No. 05-1211 (C.D.  
 12 Cal. Dec. 12, 2005).

14      13. The United States sought and obtained civil penalties and injunctive relief  
 15 against DIRECTV and the telemarketing companies that marketed DIRECTV's goods and  
 16 services in violation of the TCPA, the FCC Rules, and the Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 C.F.R.  
 17 § 310, *et seq.*

18      14. On December 14, 2005, DIRECTV entered into a Stipulated Judgment and  
 19 Order for Permanent Injunction consisting of, among other things, a civil penalty against it in  
 20 the amount of \$5,355,000 and myriad injunctions requiring compliance with the TCPA, the  
 21 FCC Rules, and Telemarketing Sales Rule's prohibitions on telemarketing calls to persons who  
 22 request not to be called and to persons whose numbers are registered on the National Do not  
 23 Call Registry.

1       15. Despite the severity of the civil penalty and the various injunctions aimed at  
 2 obtaining compliance, DIRECTV continued to willfully or knowingly violate the TCPA, the  
 3 FCC Rules, and the Telemarketing Sales Rule.

4       16. On April 16, 2009 the United States filed a second lawsuit seeking civil  
 5 penalties and injunctive relief against DIRECTV on behalf of the FTC that mirrored the  
 6 allegations made in the FTC's prior lawsuit. *United States vs. DIRECTV, Inc.*, No. 09-02605  
 7 (C.D. Cal. April 16, 2009).

8       17. In May of 2009, DIRECTV agreed to a second Stipulated Judgment and Order  
 9 for Permanent Injunction in which it agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$2,310,000 and again  
 10 consented to a host of injunctive relief, including requirements that it monitor telemarketing  
 11 campaigns and its authorized marketers to ensure compliance with the TCPA, the FCC Rules,  
 12 and the Telemarketing Sales Rule.  
 13

14

15       **B. DIRECTV made non-emergency calls to the cellular phones of Plaintiff and other  
 16 consumers using an automatic telephone dialing system or prerecorded voice  
 17 without their prior express written consent.**

18       18. Plaintiff's telephone number, (XXX) XXX-7970, is assigned to a cellular  
 19 telephone service.

20       19. Plaintiff has not been a DIRECTV customer or subscriber at any time and has  
 21 never consented to receive calls from DIRECTV.

22       20. In 2017 and 2018, DIRECTV or its agents made approximately 30 telemarketing  
 23 calls to Mr. Farrell's cellular phone.

24       21. The telemarketing calls Mr. Farrell received had all the signs of being placed  
 25 automatically using a predictive dialer. When Mr. Farrell answered the phone, he would say  
 26 "hello" but no one would respond right away. Many times, Mr. Farrell was forced to repeat his  
 27 greeting before an agent would finally get on the line.

1       22. Mr. Farrell had not consented to receive the calls and did not know how  
 2 DIRECTV got his number. When Mr. Farrell asked the DIRECTV agent how DIRECTV got  
 3 his telephone number, he did not receive an answer.

4       23. Mr. Farrell repeatedly asked DIRECTV to stop the calls. However, DIRECTV  
 5 or its agents continued to call him without his consent.

6       24. The content of the calls that Mr. Farrell received from or on behalf of DirectTV  
 7 demonstrate that the calls were not made for an emergency purpose.

8       25. DIRECTV is acutely aware of the TCPA's prohibitions against the use of an  
 9 ATDS or artificial or prerecorded voices to make calls to cellular phones without the prior  
 10 express written consent of the called party. Yet, despite the FTC lawsuits and numerous others  
 11 filed by consumers, DIRECTV or its agents knowingly or willfully violated the TCPA and  
 12 FCC Rules by making calls to the cellular telephones of Plaintiff and other similarly-situated  
 13 consumers using an ATDS or artificial or prerecorded voice without their prior express written  
 14 consent.

15 **C. DIRECTV's violations of the TCPA injured Plaintiff.**

16       26. During the relevant period, Plaintiff has carried his cellular phone with him at  
 17 most times so that he can be available to family, friends, and his employer.

18       27. DIRECTV's or its agents' calls invaded Plaintiff's privacy and intruded upon  
 19 his right to seclusion. The calls frustrated and upset Plaintiff by interrupting his daily life and  
 20 wasting his time.

21       28. DIRECTV's or its agents' calls intruded upon and occupied the capacity of  
 22 Plaintiff's cellular phone and depleted the battery of Plaintiff's cellular phone. The calls  
 23 temporarily seized and trespassed upon Plaintiff's use of his cellular phone, and caused him to  
 24 divert attention away from other activities to address the calls.

25

26

27

1                   **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2                 29. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rules 23(a),  
 3 (b)(2), and (b)(3) as a representative of the following Class:

4                 All persons or entities within the United States who (1) received,  
 5 on or after January 24, 2016; (2) a non-emergency telemarketing  
 6 call to his or her cellular telephone; (3) from or on behalf of  
 7 DIRECTV; (4) promoting goods or services; (5) using an  
 automatic telephone dialing system or artificial or prerecorded  
 voice; and (6) have never been a subscriber of DIRECTV.

8                 Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the Class definition following an appropriate period of  
 9 discovery.

10                30. Excluded from the Class are DIRECTV, its employees, agents and assigns, and  
 11 any members of the judiciary to whom this case is assigned, their respective court staff, and  
 12 Plaintiff's counsel.

13                   **Numerosity**

14                31. At the time of filing, Plaintiff does not know the exact number of Class  
 15 members. But the number of DIRECTV customers indicates that Class members likely number  
 16 in the thousands and are geographically disbursed throughout the country.

17                32. The alleged size and geographic dispersal of the Class makes joinder of all Class  
 18 members impracticable.

19                   **Commonality and Predominance**

20                33. Common questions of law and fact exist with regard to each of the claims and  
 21 predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members. Questions common to the  
 22 Class include:

23                a.         Whether DIRECTV or its agents used an ATDS or artificial or  
 24 prerecorded voice in connection with the placement of non-emergency calls on the cellular  
 25 telephones of Plaintiff and Class members without their prior express written consent;

26                b.         Whether DIRECTV's or its agents' telephone calls were made  
 27 knowingly or willfully;

- c. Whether Plaintiff and Class members were injured by receiving such calls; and
- d. Whether DIRECTV should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

## Typicality

34. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class, in that Plaintiff, like all Class members, has been injured by DIRECTV's or its agents' uniform misconduct—the placement of calls to cellular telephones for non-emergency purposes without the prior written express consent of the called parties.

## Adequacy of Representation

35. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class and is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in class action litigation and matters involving TCPA violations.

## Superiority

36. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Because the amount of each individual Class member's claim is small relative to the complexity of the litigation, and because of DIRECTV's financial resources, Class members are unlikely to pursue legal redress individually for the violations detailed in this complaint. Class-wide damages are essential to induce DIRECTV to comply with federal law. Individualized litigation would significantly increase the delay and expense to all parties and to the Court and would create the potential for inconsistent and contradictory rulings. By contrast, a class action presents fewer management difficulties, allows claims to be heard which would otherwise go unheard because of the expense of bringing individual lawsuits, and provides the benefits of adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

## **VI. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1) and 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 for calls made using an ATDS or artificial or prerecorded voice**

37. DIRECTV violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1) by placing non-emergency calls to cellular telephone numbers, either directly or through the actions of others, using an ATDS or artificial or prerecorded voice without the prior express written consent of the called party.

## VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class defined above, respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Determine that the claims alleged herein may be maintained as a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, and issue an order certifying the Class defined above and appointing Plaintiff as the Class representative;
  - B. Award \$500 in statutory damages for each and every call that DIRECTV negligently placed in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1) of the TCPA;
  - C. Award \$1,500 in statutory damages for each and every call that DIRECTV willfully or knowingly placed in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1) of the TCPA;
  - D. Grant appropriate injunctive and declaratory relief, including, without limitation, an order requiring DIRECTV to implement measures to stop future violations of the TCPA; and
  - E. Grant such further relief as the Court deems proper.

## **VIII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED AND DATED this 24th day of January, 2020.

2 TERRELL MARSHALL LAW GROUP PLLC

3  
4 By: /s/ Beth E. Terrell, WSBA #26759  
5 Beth E. Terrell, WSBA #26759  
6 Email: bterrell@terrellmarshall.com

7 By: /s/ Jennifer Rust Murray, WSBA #36983  
8 Jennifer Rust Murray, WSBA #36983  
9 Email: jmurray@terrellmarshall.com  
936 North 34th Street, Suite 300  
Seattle, Washington 98103-8869  
Telephone: (206) 816-6603  
Facsimile: (206) 319-5450

10  
11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27